

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-33 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1-2, 4, 7-8, 10-11, 13-14, 16-18, 20, 22-23, 25, 29, and 31-33 are currently amended. Claims 5 and 19 have been canceled. Applicants submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1-4, 6-18, and 20-33 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 19 and 22 are objected to due to informalities. Claims 1-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,035,306 to Lowenthal et al. (hereinafter "Lowenthal").

Objections to the Claims

In regard to claim 19, Applicants have canceled claim 19. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to claim 19.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

In regard to claim 22, Applicants have amended the claim as suggested in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections to claim 22.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-33 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Lowenthal.

Applicants respectfully note that to anticipate a pending claim, a prior art reference must provide, either expressly or inherently, each and every limitation of the pending claim. (M.P.E.P. § 2131).

The Office Action alleges that Lowenthal teaches or suggests all of the claim limitations of claims 1-33. However, based on the arguments presented below, Applicants respectfully submit that Lowenthal fails to teach or suggest at least one of the claim limitation recited in each of claims 1-33.

Claim 1

Amended claim 1 recites a method for diagnosing performance in a database, the method comprising:

receiving information indicative of a set of rules classifying operations performed in a database as one or more performance problems;

determining one or more values that quantify an impact for the one or more performance problem based on performance of operations in the database;

determining a first performance problem from the one or more performance problems based on a matching between the one or more values for the one or more performance problems and at least one rule in the set of rules; and

generating information indicative of a recommendation for a solution for the first performance problem.

Applicants respectfully submit that Lowenthal fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation recited in claim 1.

For example, as recited above, information is receive indicative of a set of rules classifying operations performed in a database as one or more performance problems. The Office Action alleges that the 3 “goals” of a DBA discussed in Lowenthal are equivalent to performance problems as recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Lowenthal merely states that the objective of a DBA in doing placement of data is the achieve three goals. First, to parallelize access to data. Second, is to load-level access. And, third, is to choose placement that avoids pile-up. Lowenthal states that optimal placement is achieved when all three of these objectives are met perfectly and is the goal of DBAs in performing placement.

In contrast amended claim 1 recites classifying operations performed in a database as one or more performance problems. Typically, performance problems are something to be avoided or minimized. However, Lowenthal encourages achievement of all three of the above discussed objectives. Thus, while there may be situations that prevent the DBA from achieving perfect placement, Lowenthal fails to teach or suggest the feature recited in claim 1 of

“receiving information indicative of a set of rules classifying operations performed in a database as one or more performance problems” by establishing three abstract goals or objectives that describe perfect placement.

In another example, amended claim 1 recites the feature of “determining a first performance problem from the one or more performance problems based on a matching between the one or more values for the one or more performance problems and at least one rule in the set of rules.” The Office Action alleges that Lowenthol discloses the above-recited feature in part by the DBA looking at the raw data in an attempt to determine a problem in Col. 13, lines 50-56. The Office Action further alleges that Lowenthol discloses rules that are used to determine the first performance problem in Col. 14, lines 7-16 where different properties are more or less important depending on the particular application of the database being analyzed. However, Applicants respectfully submit that a DBA reviewing raw data based on the DBA’s subjective determination of which properties are more or less important as in Lowenthol is substantially different from determining a performance problem from one or more performance problems classified by a set of rules based on a matching between one or more values for the one or more performance problems and at least one rule in the set of rules as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Lowenthol fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation as recited in claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Claim 2

Amended claim 2 recites the feature of “wherein the set of rules for the one or more performance problems include symptoms and root problems, wherein symptoms are analyzed to determine a root performance problem.” The Office Action alleges that Lowenthol discloses the above-recited feature in Col. 5, lines 11-25 where Lowenthol simply suggests that if Table A and index 1 are both heavily used, the three disks that will be overloaded. However, Lowenthol’s hypothetical scenario that the three disks are overloaded does not teach or suggest that the heavy usage is a rule symptom as recited in claim 2, nor that the symptom is analyzed as recited in claim 2.

Claim 3

Claim 3 recites the feature of “wherein the symptoms are classified from a first set of performance problems to a second set of performance problems.” The Office Action alleges that Lowenthol discloses that above-recited feature in Col. 12, lines 22-28 where the DBA of Lowenthol is able to drill down to different levels of data displayed. However, simply allowing the user to drill down from data representing a disk, to a volume, to a plex, or to a tablespace does not teach or suggest that symptoms are classified from a first set of performance problems to a second set of performance problems. The data displayed in Lowenthol is simply raw data. When displayed, the DBA has to determine whether the raw data indicates a problem, (e.g., the DBA has to decided whether a specific value of the raw data is a symptom of a yet to be determined problem). Therefore, the data in Lowenthol is merely raw data, which is substantially different from the symptoms recited in claim 3, and even more different from symptoms that are classified from a first set of performance problems to a second set of performance problems as recited in claim 3.

Claims 2-4, 6-18, and 20-33

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 14, 26, and 29 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1, and others. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-4 and 6-13, 15-18 and 20-25, 27-28, and 30-33 and that depend directly and/or indirectly from the independent claims 1, 14, 26, and 29 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons, some of which are discussed above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter/
Sean F. Parmenter
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
SFP:ama
61182860 v1